

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILIN		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/644,657		08/19/2003	Frank Benincasa	1330-002-2	5446		
33461	7590	06/02/2004		EXAMINER			
	AN LAW	GROUP RAL AVENUE	NGUYEN, CHI Q				
SUITE 11		RAL AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
PHOENIX	K, AZ 850	04	3635				
				DATE MAILED, 07/02/200	DATE MAIL ED. 06/02/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					M					
		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)						
•		10/644,	657	BENINCASA ET A	AL.					
****	Office Action Summary	Examine	er	Art Unit						
		Chi Q No		3635						
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	cation appears on th	ne cover sheet with the d	correspondence ad	ldress					
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI Insions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no eunication. of days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the apply ap	event, however, may a reply be tin atutory minimum of thirty (30) day will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from oplication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this or D (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
Status										
1)🖾	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>19 August 200</u>	<u>3</u> .							
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL .	b)⊠ This action is	non-final.							
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Dispositi	on of Claims									
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□										
Applicati	on Papers									
9)	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.								
10)🛛	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>19 August 2003</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.									
	Applicant may not request that any object			• •						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	·	-,,		. ,					
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119									
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 										
Attachment	• ,		_							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da							
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F			atent Application (PTC)-152)					

Jun 1821 - But was a great a survey of a survey of the sur

Application/Control Number: 10/644,657

Art Unit: 3635

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the boat must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-24 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,606,829. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

Application/Control Number: 10/644,657

Art Unit: 3635

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 24 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,829 in view of Woyjeck (US 6,481,364. The instant application's claim 24 is corresponding to the patented claim 23 except for at least one graspable arm extending from the hammer weight in a direction perpendicular to the longitudinal axis. Woyjeck teaches anchoring device 10 including a hammer 12, and at least one graspable arm 28 extending from the hammer 12 (col. 4, lines 35-36, fig. 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the instant claimed invention with Woyjeck for the extending graspable arm. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a handle to hold and operate the hammer manually by operator.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Callaway (US 5,564,232), Owen (US 5,613,458), Dvorak (US 5,699,864), Winters (US 6,148,929) teach anchoring device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Mon-Thu (7:00-5:30), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be

Application/Control Number: 10/644,657

Art Unit: 3635

Page 4

reached at (703) 308-0839. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

(*)J*U CQN 5/24/04

> Carl D. Friedman Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3600